

# ***WAWF/UID/RFID***

## ***Industry Meeting Notes***

### ***(Data Capture & Delivery)***

**December 13<sup>th</sup> - 14<sup>th</sup> , 2005**

***Green indicates a comment***

***Orange Indicates an action item***



# WAWF/UID/RFID Industry Group Meeting

## (Data Capture and Delivery)

### Focus Group Reports

- **Address RFID Security Issues**
  - **Form new focus group - Greg Tsiknas, MilPac RFID Product Manager, Susan Pucelik, OSD PoC - Kathy Smith, Rich Culbertson, Claudine Dupere, Pat Funke, Jonathan Gregory, (Resource - Jeff Harris), Carolyn Tobin**
  - **Suggestion made to coordinate with ATA RFID efforts**
- **Assessment of Paper Transactions Jan Wilhelm**
  - **Identify non-standard payment processes and the impact these processes are having on payment ( Nancy Robinson, Kevin McRae, Brandi Smith, Sandra Perrin) (See attachment)**
  - **Tito's group is looking into the possibility of handling classified contracts.**
- **Amended Shipping Instructions Sandra Perrin/Darcy Smith**
  - **Collect statistics and report on the impact of amended shipping instructions if they are not loaded timely. Need statistics that include the DD250 recycle time and what contracting system is involved**
  - **Ed Tuorinsky will work with Tito to see if there is a better solution. PCO mod is not a priority and takes a long time to complete. This is a policy problem.**
- **Acceptance Transaction Requirements Document Andy Z**
  - **Develop a set of requirements for a structured Acceptance/Rejection transaction (Evelyn Thompson, Mark Robinson, Greg Tsiknas) (See attachment) if high on the industry enhancement priority list Andy Z will continue to lead this focus group**
- **Embedded UID Reporting Darcy Smith**
  - **Produce a white paper concerning the potential of reporting embedded items in WAWF (Dick Erickson, Susan Pucelik, Ann Stansbarger)**

# Panel Discussion Items

- **Greg Tsiknas**

- Business process behind GFP (roles, transactions) **LeAntha took the action to map common process scenarios**

- Contractor Testing **The current release schedule was too tight to insert contractor testing. Will look into supporting that next release. (Tito)**

- Update on Structured Response

- Initiator Comments Support in 856/857 - **Jim Craig is delivering an ECP within the week to support this.**
    - RFID Support for Combo - **Michelle Woldt will find out how often we have discounts on the contract, we should suggest what scenarios we need documented.**
    - Govt agencies mandating that we use the COMBO? **Michelle - the fallout occurs if 2N1 is specified and COMBO is used. Marine Corps is rejecting if the contract specifies a transaction and that method is not used. The solution is to communicate with the program office identifying that we cannot technically meet the requirement so that the template can be modified. 2N1 and RFID doesn't work together - Ed will identify the problem to the Marine Corps as well.**
    - Forecast for Embedded Item registration via RRs - **Bruce, at present there is not a plan to put embedded items in WAWF**

- **Susan Pucelik**

- Highlights of the Sub-to-Prime Data Exchange **(see attachment from Bill Zirkel)**
  - Highlights from the DoD on the requirements for reporting imbedded UIDs from a supplier would be helpful.

- **Cindy Finucan**

- Withholds or other adjusted Billing amounts will not appear in "Block 20", but the withhold information can be described in Block 16 as text and it will appear when LM transmits the RR to Lakeland for billing. **(can only be added in descriptive text)**
  - Corrections, after Acceptance, but if the error is caught before Acceptance then the RR can be voided out of WAWF and re-submitted as an Original **The miscellaneous tab in WAWF will show it was voided, but the new transaction does not point back to the voided one (potential audit issue). Jim Craig suggested to put this issue on the enhancement list**
  - DODAACs not active in WAWF (or non-users of WAWF, like N61339) **Contact Ed Tuornisky**
  - Ship To or Ship From Cage Codes that are not active in the CCR.
  - Destination DD250s having an Acceptance code that doesn't match the Ship To **use Other as the acceptance point and MOCAS recognizes the Destination point. Ship to will still be your cage code for ship in place.**

- **Jeff Harris**

- RFID Tags Numbers & Sub-contractors (Packaging Company) **resolved**

# Panel Discussion Items

**Nancy Robinson**

1) **GFP and LDD (lost, damaged, or destroyed property) --**

**Government property comes to the plant site via DD1149 or other Raytheon sites and gets lost, damaged or destroyed. Whenever I have an LDD, I work with DCMA to notify them of lost, damage or destroyed property. How will that work with the new features in WAWF -- included now, next release, or not ever?**

2) **When PIPC is not used for two years, it is submitted to the program for need or no need. If there's no need, then it goes to PCARSS (plant clearance and re-utilization screening system) which is a Government system for disposition. Will WAWF be used here? The decision making process to dispose of PIPC is done in LDD and PCARS and property transfer goes through WAWF. DFARs will define this**

3) **New RFID policy -- does the DFAR change existing contracts, or only apply to new contracts? What about MOD delivery changes on existing contracts?**

4) **DoD suppliers passive RFID information guide states:**

**"The final policy, released in July 2004, requires passive RFID tagging at the case, pallet and the item packaging (unit pack), with appropriate contract clause." Does RFID have to be written specifically into the contract or does the wording "mark in accordance with MIL-STD 129" cover the requirement?**

5) **We currently ship large installation kits (from 100 to 3000 individual packaged items) to depots. Will/Could there be a RFID requirement at the inner pack level of these kits? Can the requirement be tied to embedded items, or just to the top-level item on the CLIN?**

**There is not a plan to get down to RFID inside the kit. Before we can get to the component level some things must be worked out with WAWF. Reading the tag will identify skid as the unit...if it is truly a palletized unit. If the skid is just a pallet of convenience, each box is marked. When a CLIN spans multiple pallets there is no tag on the pallet because it is considered a pallet of convenience. There is a meeting with Dell next week to discuss these scenarios concerning Tag system, monitoring. Bruce - create informational sublines in the transaction that describe the way it is packed. you can't pack one clin item in 7 boxes...Today you must tag one box only**

**Brad Cougher - OSD needs to discuss these RFID marking scenarios and get back to us on this topic.**

6) **Is reading the RFID tag information part of the DCMA acceptance criteria?**

7) **Is the submittal of RFID tag data to WAWF part of the DCMA acceptance criteria?**

8) **The Uniform Resource Locator (URL) link listed in the DFARS clause is a pointer to a dynamic web page. In fact, one of the documents referred to at the web site (the DoD RFID Supplier Guide was recently updated from Version 7.0 to Version 8.0. How can a link to a dynamic site be contractually binding?**

9) **Re: GFP --**

**Is there a requirement for GFP shipper/receiver transactions when GFP is moved between cage codes for the same company? (example: Raytheon McKinney to Raytheon Goleta)**

**question not related to those three big topics, but to WAWF 3.0.9 - adding support for services:**

10) **Per the FAR if you are processing a DD250 that is a service and you are not shipping material the FAR says to leave Blocks 4 ,13 and 14 blank. Block 13 is the ship to address -- if you leave this field out, WAWF will reject the transaction. How is this reconciled in the support of services in 3.0.9?**

**Tito will follow up**

# Panel Discussion Items

- **Sandra Perrin**

- **PP AND PBP Certifier - WAWF shortcoming.** Certifier is not allowed to be populated. Fills in the submitter user ID if batch loading. If online web input it would assume the logon name of the inputer, not the Certifier. **Use Certifier name in prime address line so that it is visible**
- **DCMA took the action to document this and add to FAQs for ACO information.** They realize this is an on-going issue as new officers are trained in WAWF
- **EDA is loaded with an incorrect Issued By Code - causes the transaction to fail on import (Air Force contracts, happened 3 times in one week) fixed in 3.0.9**
- **Navy Codes not on line Work these through Ed Tuorinsky**
- **CLIN 9999 contracts are still being written SAMS DLA contracts still have these CLIN numbers on them. Contact is Beth Althman. Michelle will ask Dave to clarify the issue and will then pass on to Beth.**

- **Pat Jacklets**

- **UID Q/A package (This package will be completed and distributed)**

- **Bill - UID requirement of cost must be provided on shipper - this is an issue with direct shipped items. Suggest that it not be rejected with a \$0 acquisition cost and allow prime contractor to go in and add cost after the fact. Can you hide the cost for the supplier extension. Recommend adding this in the Enhancement Requests. Anomaly to this proposal is that International Shipments must contain a price.**

- **Registry is the source for acquisition value for GFP - why does the contractor need to report the costs? Does the FAR 45 re-write eliminate the need for maintaining the acquisition cost? Sara Bowles - short answer is no. Bruce and Lydia will research this concern.**

- **Proposal of a new focus group (Susan Pucelik) - Boeing strategy is taking RFID to the part level. AIA should address getting RFID to the Item level ahead of the curve, work on convergence of item level RFID for commercial and aerospace.**



# Tito Maldonado - Preview of Version 3.0.9

- *Will soon be announcing a sunset date for WINS and EDI*
- *Joint Staff is starting to use WAWF now*
- *Version 3.0.9 - proposed release date is Jan 16<sup>th</sup>*
- *Government roles can only do receipt of PIPC via the web only*
- *New roles involve*
  - *contractor to contractor change of custody*
  - *contractor to DoD*
  - *DoD to contractor*
  - *contract to contract*
- *Query Results*
  - *Active transactions are 90 days, but the query screen defaults to 30 days*
  - *Archive holds transactions older than 90 days*
- *Zero Lot Shipments with UID*
  - *An Actual Quantity field has been added to reflect the quantity being shipped to allow reporting of the UID, MILSTRIP, and RFID*
- *Limit EDA access*
  - *Cage code extensions can now be restricted from viewing the contract in EDA*
- *Functionality exists to create an invoice from archived receiving report*
- *Service RR can be submitted through WAWF for MOCAS contracts that are written as service line items. Industry requests that this be communicated to the DCMA offices*
- *WAWF will process invoices for non-DCMA administered contracts paid by MOCAS*
- *Additional validation rules applied at input to reduce errors and rejects. Bruce Probert will provide to industry the list of new validation rules being applied*

# Lydia Dawson - GFP Process

- **DD1662 eliminated after Sept '06 - All property in UID registry by 9/30/07**
- **Initial load to the registry**
  - \$5K or more only
  - Line Items only, no embedded items unless they are separated and become discreet items
  - CAP not included until it becomes Government Property
  - LVP and GFM are optional for initial load
- **GFP (subset of Legacy) will use virtual UIIs and trigger events to actually apply mark**
- **Only changes in custody that can go through WAWF - change in custody, current part no, current part date, 2D Compliance**
- **Use Guide for 1<sup>st</sup> submission - 3 steps (see attachment)**
- **Once submitted must synchronize with the registry at least twice a year**
- **UID Access controls will be revamped. Bruce will provide us with a high level description of new control structure**
- **Send 32MB maximum file size to the registry for now. Large files will go to a hold directory until off-peak hours, then load.**
- **URL links in the DFARS - How do you protect your company when the link changes and no revision of those changes exist? Print out the copy at the time your contract is issued. Note what version is in effect at the time of contract award.**

# **LeAntha Sumpter - Strategic Direction**

- **One Con Ops for all of DoD being developed**
- **Services priority list includes**
  - **Marking items, training, getting clause into contracts**
- **Clarifying requirements for imbedded items**
  - **February Discussion - Don't put embedded in WAWF...will confuse billable and non-billable data**
- **SAP ASUG group - should include industry and services**
- **1<sup>st</sup> Military Equipment Valuation in 2006 (Sara & Tom) BMMP website - Kim Pisall will publish list in January...The link to the SFIS website is [http://DoD.mil/BMMP/SFIS\\_resources.html](http://DoD.mil/BMMP/SFIS_resources.html)**

**MIL-STD-130M has been released - key is Machine Readable marking**

- **PCARS changes should be same as to registry changes PCARS data will be ported to WAWF so that an 856 transaction can be built**
- **Goal - 100 Million UIDs by 2010**



# **Paul Donato - RFID Update**

- **DFARS final rule 9/14/05**
- **2005 DFARS**
  - *Class II, VI, IX, I, shipped to Susquehanna and San Joaquin only*
- **2006 DFARS**
  - *Class III, IV, VIII, shipped to all CONUS (18) distribution centers, 3 strategic aerial ports*
  - *Must be a clause in the contract*
  - *Publication date: TBD*
- **If you are buying tags now you should order Gen II tags**
- **Sunset date on 64 bit tags was planned to be within 6 months to 2yrs after the release of Gen II technology. (about one year left)**
- **The DoD construct is an EPCglobal compliant construct. It was developed as a DoD construct but has been ratified by EPCglobal.**

# **Michelle Woldt - Army Implementation**

- ***DFAS Role in rolling out WAWF for the Army is implementation, training, GAM, and help desk***
- ***The Army's role is policy, prepare contracts, monitor status, and sustainment***
- ***Michelle will send contact names for Army contract issues...***
- ***Ft Sill - fully deployed, Ft Hood - partially deployed***

# **Ed Tourinsky - Navy Implementation**

- ***The Navy WAWF interface will be available in WAWF 3.0.10 expected for release in June, 2006***
- ***Test conditions are being written now. They may ask for testing from contractor around the March timeframe***
- ***Navy ERP Interface will work like DSS - transaction will flow to ERP system for approval. LPO code will no longer be required***
- ***Fleet Forces Command deployment of WAWF expected in Nov 05, NAVFAC HQ in Dec 05***
- ***Listing of Navy Codes that are active in WAWF - should be reliable by year end (maybe next summer)***
- ***The Marine Corps is 80% deployed***
- ***Ed will send out the Marine Corps points of contacts***